

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-28 are now present in this application. Claim 1 is independent.

Claims 3, 5-20 and 22-25 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. Claims 1-28 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 28 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

Examiner Interview

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the telephonic interviews which were conducted on February 22, 2010, March 8, 2010 and March 10, 2010.

During the interview on February 22, 2010, the Examiner stated that in his opinion, in order to overcome the applied prior art, the claims should be amended to include clarifications on the arrangement of two refrigerant circuits as shown on Figures 25 and 26 of the present application, as well as the operation between the two refrigerant circuits and a compressor.

In light of the discussion above, proposed changes to the claims were discussed in an attempt to overcome the prior art rejections of record during the interviews on March 8, 2010 and March 10, 2010. The claims have been amended in the manner discussed during the interviews, and are believed to place the application into condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

Claims 4, 21, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner still considers the feature of a plurality of utilization side heat exchangers including first and second adsorption heat exchangers as recited in claims 4, 21, 26 and 27 being unclear because an adsorption heat exchanger has already been claimed in claim 1. Also, the Examiner contends that the claims are unclear as to whether the previously claimed air heat exchanger has been excluded or included as a utilization side heat exchanger.

In order to overcome this rejection, Applicants have amended claims 4, 21, 26 and 27 as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 21, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jung, US 5,823,006 (hereinafter “Jung”) in view of Mathiprakasam, US 4,430,864 (hereinafter “Mathiprakasam”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

As discussed above, independent claim 1 has been amended in the manner discussed during the interviews with the Examiner. Specifically, independent claim 1 as amended recites, *inter alia*,

a first refrigerant circuit provided with a heat-source side heat exchanger, an air heat exchanger, a first four-way selector valve, and a first variable-opening expansion valve; and

a second refrigerant circuit provided with a first adsorption heat exchanger, a second adsorption heat exchanger, a second four-way selector valve, and a second variable-opening expansion valve; wherein...

the first and second four-way selector valves are controlled for providing a flow passage of refrigerant from the compressor to the air heat exchanger and the heat source side heat exchanger and back to the compressor via the first four-way selector valve, while providing a flow passage of refrigerant from the compressor to the first and second adsorption heat exchangers and back to the compressor via the second four-way selector valve.

As agreed by the Examiner during the interviews, the asserted combination of Mathiprakasam and Jung fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned claimed features.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the asserted combination of Jung and Mathiprakasam (assuming the references can be combined, which Applicants do not admit) fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness. As claims 2, 4, 21, 26 and 27 depend from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also patentable for at least their dependency. Thus, it is further respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 21, 26 and 27 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Dennis Powei Chen, Registration No. 61,767 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: May 6, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

D. Richard Anderson

Registration No.: 40439

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

703-205-8000